

OPINION 1184

DITYLENCHUS FILIPJEV, 1936, GIVEN
NOMENCLATURAL PRECEDENCE OVER
CHITINOTYLENCHUS MICOLETZKY, 1922
(NEMATODA)

RULING.-(1) Under the plenary powers it is hereby ruled that the generic name *Ditylenchus* Filipjev, 1936, is to be given nomenclatural precedence over the generic name *Chitinotylenchus* Micoletzky, 1922, whenever the two names are considered synonyms.

(2) The generic name *Ditylenchus* Filipjev, 1936 (gender: masculine), type species, by original designation, *Anguillula dipsaci* Kuhn, 1857, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names with the Name Number 2125 and with an endorsement that it is to be given nomenclatural precedence over *Chitinotylenchus* Micoletzky, 1922, whenever the two names are regarded as synonyms.

(3) The generic name *Chitinotylenchus* Micoletzky, 1922 (gender: masculine), type species, by subsequent designation by Filipjev, 1936, *Chitinotylenchus paragracilis* Micoletzky, 1922, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2126, and with an endorsement that it is not to be given priority over *Ditylenchus* Filipjev, 1936, whenever the two names are regarded as synonyms.

(4) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

- (a) *dipsaci* Kuhn, 1857, as published in the binomen *Anguillula dipsaci* (specific name of type species of *Ditylenchus* Filipjev, 1936) (Name Number 2751);
- (b) *paragracilis* Micoletzky, 1922, as published in the binomen *Chitinotylenchus paragracilis* (specific name of type species of *Chitinotylenchus* Micoletzky, 1922) (Name Number 2752).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)1955

The report on which the present Opinion is based was prepared by the Secretary and published on 31 March 1977 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 33, pp. 241-244. Notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general and one nematological journal. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 5 September 1980 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule, in Voting Paper (80)21 in Part 1 for or against the use of the plenary powers in the case, and in Part 2 to use those powers either to reaffirm the decision to suppress *Chitinotylenchus* Micoletzky, 1922, taken in Voting Paper (75)7, or to give *Ditylenchus* Filipjev, 1936, nomenclatural precedence over *Chitinotylenchus*. At the close of the voting period on 5 December 1980, the state of the voting was as follows:

Part 1

Affirmative Votes — twenty-one (21) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Mroczkowski, Willink, Starobogatov, Trjapitzin, Lehtinen, Hahn, Brinck, Corliss, Dupuis, Habe, Ride, Welch, Alvarado, Cogger, Sabrosky, Heppell, Bayer, Halvorsen, Nye

Negative Votes — none (0)

Part 2

Alternative A

Affirmative Votes — four (4): Melville, Lehtinen, Ride, Alvarado

Alternative B

Affirmative Votes — seventeen (17) received in the following order: Holthuis, Mroczkowski, Willink, Starobogatov, Trjapitzin, Hahn, Habe, Brinck, Corliss, Dupuis, Welch, Cogger, Sabrosky, Heppell, Bayer, Halvorsen, Nye

Tortonese abstained from voting. Vokes was on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Bernardi, Binder and Kraus.

Professor Tortonese observed: 'From their statements, the different specialists do not agree about the separation of the genera *Ditylenchus* and *Chitinotylenchus*. We cannot solve the nomenclatural problem if the taxonomic problem remains unsolved. I therefore agree with Professor Andrassy's opinion (*Bull.* vol. 33, p. 243): I do not consider that *Ditylenchus* is threatened by a name that may be a synonym but on the value of which we are not sure.'

Dr Ride said: 'If taxonomists decide that *Chitinotylenchus* really merits taxonomic separation from *Ditylenchus*, let them start afresh with good type material.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

Chitinotylenchus Micoletzky, 1922, *Arch. Naturges.*, vol. A 87, pp. 546, 575

dipsaci, *Anguillula*, Kuhn, 1857, *Z. wiss. Zool.*, vol. 9, pp. 129–137

Ditylenchus Filipjev, 1936, *Proc. helminthol. Soc. Washington*, vol. 3, pp. 81–82

paragracilis, *Chitinotylenchus*, Micoletzky, 1922, *Arch. Naturges.*, vol. A 87, pp. 547, 575.

The following is the original reference to a type-species designation accepted in the ruling given in the present Opinion: of *Chitinotylenchus paragracilis* as type species of *Chitinotylenchus* by subsequent designation:

Filipjev, 1936, *Proc. helminthol. Soc. Washington*, vol. 3, p. 81.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(80)21 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1184.

R.V. MELVILLE

Secretary

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

London

14 January 1981